

## 2. The *Complete Works* of Aristotle: What Is Included and How the Collection Came About

---

What is included in an edition called the “*Complete Works*” of Aristotle? Everything Aristotle ever wrote? Or everything he ever published? Unfortunately, the formation of the Aristotelian oeuvre is more complicated and, also, much more fortuitous than these two possible answers may suggest. For, as a matter of fact, a significant part of what Aristotle wrote or published is lost (probably for all time), whereas major parts of what we nowadays regard as the essential works of Aristotle—for example, his *Metaphysics*, *Prior Analytics*, or *Nicomachean Ethics*—were probably never meant for publication. But let us take one thing at a time!

What we now regard as “the works” or “the complete works” of Aristotle ultimately originates from an ancient collection of treatises attributed to him. This collection was originally compiled between the first century BC and the second century AD, a few centuries after Aristotle’s death. These works have been transmitted under the name of “Aristotle” and are commonly known as the *Corpus Aristotelicum*. For centuries, the works included in it were copied and transmitted as manuscripts, because they were considered the authentic contributions of the renowned Greek philosopher Aristotle, representing his complete or essential body of work.

None of the works within the *Corpus* have survived as ancient papyri. The oldest existing Greek manuscripts of them date back to the ninth century AD. During this period, ancient majuscule manuscripts (lacking accents and spaces) of esteemed authors were transliterated in Constantinople into more readable minuscule manuscripts, featuring accentuation and spacing between words. Around the same time, starting in the ninth century, a well-orchestrated initiative in Baghdad aimed to translate Aristotle’s works into Arabic, sometimes using Syriac translations, as certain key translators were Syriac scholars proficient in both Greek and Arabic. The first printed edition of the Greek text containing all the works in the *Corpus Aristotelicum* (except for the *Poetics* and the *Rhetoric*), known as the *Aldina*, was published in Venice between 1495 and 1498 by the editor Aldus Manutius.

The basis for modern scholarship on Aristotle’s works is the critical edition organized by the Prussian Academy of Sciences in Berlin and edited by Immanuel Bekker in 1831. This edition, consisting of two volumes, slightly reorganized the order of the treatises relative to the *Aldina* and resulted from a comparison of the greater number of manuscripts available at that time. However, it retained the same treatises already present in the *Aldina* (including the *Poetics* and the *Rhetoric*), all of which were attributed to the *Corpus Aristotelicum*. The importance of the Bekker edition is reflected in the fact that Aristotle scholars continue to reference its pagination when quoting Aristotle’s works. While there is no recent complete edition of Aristotle’s Greek texts that has replaced the Bekker edition, various recent editions of specific works offer Greek texts based on the

examination of more manuscripts and an improved understanding of the interdependence between different manuscript families.

The modern reader's comprehension of what qualifies as a genuinely Aristotelian work is thus still fundamentally influenced by the *Corpus Aristotelicum*. In general, it serves as a solid guide for what should be encompassed in a complete works. Nevertheless, the *Corpus Aristotelicum* omits some of Aristotle's works and includes some works that likely were not written by Aristotle himself. Moreover, it is essential to bear in mind that even the works presumed to be authored by Aristotle himself may not be complete, may include redundant parts, or may not have been arranged by Aristotle in the manner in which they have come down to us. All these phenomena can ultimately be traced back to historical contingencies that contributed to the compilation of the *Corpus Aristotelicum*—centuries after the author's passing away and without his explicit endorsement.

## 2.1. Not Everything Is Included in the *Corpus Aristotelicum*

Our assumptions about what Aristotle might have actually written mainly depend on three types of sources: ancient catalogs of Aristotle's writings, references or quotations from later ancient authors, and Aristotle's cross-references to his own non-extant works. According to all these sources, there were works ascribed to or written by Aristotle that are absent from the *Corpus Aristotelicum*. In numerous instances of works mentioned in the ancient catalogs, we possess only the titles of the lost, supposedly Aristotelian works. In some cases, we can glean clues about the presumed subject matter of the listed works, for example, when ancient authors mention that a specific theme or thesis can be found in a certain work by Aristotle. In more fortunate (albeit comparatively rare) cases, we have substantial accounts of the content of some of the lost Aristotelian works. In certain other instances, we even have verbatim quotations from these works; only the latter case can be termed a "fragment" in the strict sense.

There are three extant ancient catalogs of Aristotle's works,<sup>1</sup> two of which rely on an earlier, one on a later inventory. The earlier inventory that is used by Diogenes Laertius and by Hesychius seems to originate from Hellenistic times, possibly drawn up for the Library of Alexandria, established after the death of Alexander the Great, in the late fourth or early third century BC. The catalog that is presented by Diogenes Laertius as a segment of his biography of Aristotle (5.22–27) mentions 141 titles and often notes the number of books composing each particular work: "*On Justice*: 4 books, *On Poets*: 3 books, *On Philosophy*: 3 books . . .," and so on. At the catalog's conclusion, Diogenes tallies this to a sum of 445,270 lines—without even mentioning some of the works most cherished by modern readers. (As a comparison, the modern Bekker edition contains around 100,000 lines in roughly 3,000 columns.) Hesychius is the author of another ancient biography of Aristotle, the so-called *Vita Hesychii*, which also includes a catalog

---

1. These are included in the Catalogs of Aristotle's Writings in Volume 2.

of Aristotle's writings. It confirms many of the titles mentioned in Diogenes, but it also lists some additional titles of works ascribed to Aristotle, amounting to a total of 185 titles. Yet the presence of a title in one of these two lists is not sufficient evidence of the work's authenticity—particularly as these lists might encompass both works by Aristotle and those authored within Aristotle's school. Still, these lists do provide some evidence that the collection featured in the *Corpus Aristotelicum* is far from comprehensive.

Some of Aristotle's lost works mentioned in the ancient catalogs were unmistakably dialogs: *On Philosophy*, *Sophist*, *On Prayer*, *On Rhetoric* or *Grylus*, *On Justice*, *On Love*, and more. Arguably, these were intended for publication and, much like the renowned dialogs of Plato, aimed at engaging a wider audience, possibly for the dissemination of Platonic-Aristotelian doctrines. Assuming that these catered to readers' needs and their limited philosophical expertise, a distinct contrast seems to emerge between them (none of which have survived as a whole), on one hand, and the Aristotelian treatises preserved in the *Corpus Aristotelicum*, on the other. Many texts in the latter group are quite dense and were presumably composed for an expert audience or in a teaching context, making them rather challenging to approach.

Consequently, it has become customary to distinguish between Aristotle's published, exoteric works (which are lost) and the preserved treatises primarily intended for internal academic purposes within a didactic curriculum (also known as "acroamatic," that is, designed for hearing only) possibly never intended for publication.<sup>2</sup> However, this overarching picture demands several caveats. Most notably, significant differences exist regarding the intended readership even within the *Corpus Aristotelicum* itself.

Some writings may have indeed functioned as lecture notes (as is frequently asserted in scholarship, presupposing that readers or listeners were already familiar with specific positions and arguments the text references), other writings adopt a more accessible style (for example, the initial books of the *Nicomachean Ethics*). Others, like Books 7 and 8 of the *Politics*, delve into practical matters—for example, whether settlers should choose coastal or mountainous areas, or discussing the recommended quantity of wine for toddlers—that are presumably of general interest and are, in any case, readily accessible. Throughout his ethical treatises, indeed, Aristotle emphasizes that his intent is not merely to understand happiness and virtue but also to contribute to effective legislation and to facilitate the genuine attainment of virtue and happiness.

Likewise, the *Rhetoric* is not solely concerned with understanding the nature of persuasion but also equips individuals for courtroom defense or successful participation in the citizen assembly. Moreover, although Aristotle's extant works on philosophy of nature envision a comprehensive, coherent project aimed at encompassing nearly all facets of the perceptible and moving world, thus appealing to advanced philosophy students, some of his logical works introduce basic techniques of proof and argumentation and seem more suitable for learners at a foundational level.

---

2. See Aulus Gellius, *Attic Nights* 20.5.11–12.

In essence, then, while it is true that the treatises included in *Corpus Aristotelicum* are not “exoteric” or “mainstream” in the same sense as the lost dialogues presumably were, yet they are not all alike and do not uniformly cater to purely academic interests.

A considerable number of the lost texts, though they were not published dialogues, do seem more generally accessible. Notably, there is a group deserving special mention: those related to the history of philosophy and the crafts. For instance, Aristotle appears to have composed treatises on the doctrines of the Pythagoreans, Democritus, the Academic philosophers Speusippus and Xenocrates, and Plato’s doctrine of eternal Forms. In the latter case, we are fortunate that Alexander of Aphrodisias, the most influential ancient Aristotle commentator, found it beneficial to quote from these treatises in order to shed light on Aristotle’s succinct arguments against the assumption of Forms in *Metaphysics* 1. Through Alexander’s quotations, we can reconstruct significant portions of Aristotle’s lost treatise *Peri Ideôn* or *On Forms* (F172–175), offering insight into how such short treatises might relate to his major works such as the *Metaphysics*.

In this treatise Aristotle appears to compile and systematize arguments used by Plato and Platonists to establish the existence of eternal Forms and Aristotle’s objections to them. As a result, Aristotle’s refutation of Plato’s doctrines in the *Metaphysics* can be concise, only referencing “the arguments from the sciences,” “the one over many,” and so on, and recalling that these arguments are untenable due to the objections established elsewhere. Consequently, it is possible that some lost treatises on the history of philosophy and the crafts served as material collections for Aristotle, potentially echoing within his extant major works.

## 2.2. The *Corpus Aristotelicum* Includes More Than It Should

Whereas many of the titles mentioned in the ancient catalogs do not align with any of the transmitted works as we know them, the *Corpus* also incorporates several treatises that seem to be misplaced here. Scholars call these works “dubious” or “spurious,” indicating that it is uncertain whether Aristotle actually authored them or that it is relatively clear that he did not. How did these works find their way into it?

First, it is crucial to recognize that even the spurious works are not unrelated to the Aristotelian oeuvre; all of them, to some extent, are connected either to the Aristotelian school or the authentic part of Aristotle’s oeuvre. They might have been written by members of Aristotle’s school or other Aristotelian philosophers. It is unsurprising that these treatises featured Aristotelian terminology and theories, leading ancient editors to accept them as works authored by Aristotle. Furthermore, it seems that in his effort to construct a comprehensive philosophical worldview, Aristotle assigned various sub-projects to his students. For instance, certain collections ascribed to Aristotle, such as the collection of political constitutions, the compilation of winners’ names from the Pythian games in Delphi (F219), and the compilation of rhetorical manuals (F158–163), might have been joint endeavors.

Likewise, some of the spurious works might have emerged from such commissioned or collaborative projects—close enough to be attributed to Aristotle, yet on closer examination, distinctly divergent. Further, some clearly spurious treatises might have been included in the *Corpus* due to their titles being mentioned in the early ancient catalogs of Aristotelian writings (for example, *Mechanics*, *Economics*, *Against the Doctrines of Melissus*, *Against the Doctrines of Xenophanes*, *Against the Doctrines of Gorgias*).

In his extant works, Aristotle refers to a treatise called *Problemata* several times. There are two treatises in the *Corpus Aristotelicum* that could potentially correspond to this reference: *Problemata Physica* and *Problemata Mechanica* (often referred to simply as the *Mechanica* or *Mechanics*). However, both these treatises seem to incorporate later material, probably influenced by Aristotle's student and friend Theophrastus. This explains why an ancient editor might have included them in Aristotle's oeuvre, even though the work Aristotle himself referred to seems to be lost or was never completed.

Another example is the *Rhetoric to Alexander*, a comprehensive manual of rhetoric, whose core tenets are, however, entirely unrelated to Aristotle's own three books on the *Rhetoric*. Ancient editors might have incorporated it due to a faked dedication letter, where the author impersonates Aristotle, dedicating the subsequent book to his former pupil, Alexander the Great.

The enigmatic treatise *On Marvelous Things Heard* oddly present in the *Corpus Aristotelicum* recounts sensational fairy tales (what we nowadays call “paradoxography”)—far from Aristotle's sober scientific approach. The point is, however, that some of these tales are derived from Aristotle's *Historia Animalium*, though quoted out of context. The presence of a connection with an Aristotelian treatise might have sufficed for its inclusion in the Aristotelian canon.

How can we identify a work in the *Corpus Aristotelicum* as spurious? The authenticity of many of these suspicious works has always been a topic of scholarly dispute. While debates about authenticity or inauthenticity have been resolved for the most part, a few dubious works still generate ongoing disputes, notably, the work called the *Magna Moralia*, and at times the *Economics* and the *Mechanics* have found advocates for their authenticity.

Scholars rely on clues such as cross-references to or from works believed to be Aristotelian and on terminological and doctrinal consistency with works known to present core Aristotelian doctrines. For instance, the small treatise *On Breath* displays an intimate familiarity with Aristotle's biological theories, yet in some aspects, it posits claims that are in direct conflict with Aristotle's statements elsewhere. The spurious treatise *On Virtues and Vices* presents an Aristotelian list of virtues and was thus included in the Aristotelian canon. However, it reveals its inconsistency by incorporating this list of virtues into the Platonic, not Aristotelian, theory of the soul. The *Magna Moralia* reiterates numerous core doctrines from Aristotle's *Eudemian* and *Nicomachean Ethics*, but a minute detail concerning the Greek dialect within this treatise presents a non-negligible problem: while Aristotle consistently employs the formulation *peri tinos* for “about something,” the author of *Magna Moralia* uses the alternative, and likely later,

formulation *hyper tinos*, which coincidentally echoes the idiom of Aristotle's student Theophrastus.

### 2.3. Some Works Might Have Been Differently Arranged

The question of authenticity has to be distinguished from the question of who is responsible for the arrangement and editions of the Aristotelian works as we know them. The *Corpus* presents us modern readers with complex works consisting of artfully connected individual books: the *Prior* and the *Posterior Analytics* consist of two books each, the *Topics* of eight books, the *Physics* of eight books, the *Metaphysics* of fourteen books, the *Rhetoric* of three books, the *Meteorology* of four books, the *Historia Animalium* of nine books, the *Eudemian Ethics* of eight, the *Nicomachean Ethics* of ten books, and so on. More often than not, an individual Aristotelian book that has come down to us as part of a complex work, such as the individual books of the *Metaphysics* or of the *Nicomachean Ethics*, presents a relatively self-contained philosophical unit or, ultimately, a distinctive step within an ongoing agenda—just as the individual chapters in a modern philosophical book are supposed to do (sometimes, however, one unified project extends over more than one book—for example, the treatment of friendship in the *Nicomachean Ethics* covers Books 8 and 9).

In many cases the composition of complex works out of several such individual books makes perfect sense, even though it is likely that the final arrangement of the individual books was the achievement of the ancient editors and not Aristotle's own work. Often the texts of the individual books contain indications about a particular book's standing within a more comprehensive work—for example, they indicate what topic has to be treated next or they refer back to what has previously been established. This is why the ancient editors could not invent major works, such as the *Metaphysics* or the *Nicomachean Ethics*, from scratch, but had to be faithful to the indications given in the Aristotelian texts. Sometimes, though, it seems that there are ill-embedded forward or backward references or editorial signposts—for example, “having dealt with such-and-such,” “we have to deal with so-and-so next”—that have not been inserted by Aristotle, but by the editors, thus justifying their independently formed editorial decisions.

Still, even though for the most part the arrangements of individual books were conducted with a view to the philosophical agenda and to indications given in the texts, it seems that there was ample room for editorial decisions and, hence, also for bad decisions. Why, for example, was the *Metaphysics* equipped not with one, but with two introductions, *Metaphysics* 1 and 2? Similarly, *Physics* 1 and 2 could have served as alternative introductions to the study of nature. If one of the two ethical treatises, the *Eudemian* and the *Nicomachean Ethics*, was meant to replace the other, why do they have three books in common? Apparently, this is due to decisions made by ancient editors, who noticed a philosophical lacuna in one of the two treatises and tried to fill the gap by inserting books from the other treatise. Why is it that the *Metaphysics* includes

one book, namely, Book 11, that consists of transcripts and excerpts from other books of the *Metaphysics* and the *Physics*?

There are many such examples in the Aristotelian oeuvre. Sometimes it is the inclusion of a particular book into a more complex work that seems to be suspicious, sometimes our puzzlement concerns the position of a particular book or chapter within a more comprehensive context. Often one gets the impression that the ancient editors were keen to arrange all the thematically related or seemingly related material they received into one and the same work: all the physical texts went into the *Physics*, all political books into the *Politics*, all metaphysical stuff into the *Metaphysics*. This is understandable from the perspective of the ancient editors, since, after all, they did not want to lose or exclude any material they took to derive from the great philosopher.

We have good reason, then, to be cautious in accepting a certain arrangement or order of individual books or chapters, because they might be the result, not of the author's intention, but of an intervention by the editors. However, this does not mean that the transmitted arrangement is merely arbitrary. It often seems, as already indicated, that the individual books fit together in a quite natural way and sometimes it is even indicated in the Aristotelian texts how the several treatises are meant to be interconnected. To some extent, it seems to be a matter of scholarly preferences or changing methodological fashions whether the unity of a complex work or the independence of its individual books and sub-projects is emphasized. At any rate, it is wise to keep in mind that while modern authors have to give their imprimatur prior to the publication of their works, Aristotle never had this opportunity. Most of the works included in the *Corpus* were probably never meant for publication, others might have been a work in progress that was continuously revised, and others were probably left unfinished at the time of Aristotle's premature death. The rest is the work of the ancient editors, which might be considered as both a blessing and a curse.

## **2.4. The Composition of the *Corpus* *Aristotelicum*: Hints and Guesses**

Who were these ominous ancient editors and how was the *Corpus* compiled? Here are some hints and guesses. The rather uncontroversial part of this story concerns the influence of Andronicus, an Aristotelian philosopher from Rhodes who came to live either in Rome or in Athens. He is traditionally supposed to be responsible, to some extent, for the collection and arrangement of works that make up the *Corpus*.

According to the geographer Strabo (*Geographica* 13.1.54), Aristotle's most important student, Theophrastus, bequeathed his library, which also contained the writings of Aristotle, to his student Neleus. Neleus again sold one part of this collection to the Library of Alexandria, but took the remaining part to Scepsis in Asia Minor, his hometown, where it was kept by some of his descendants. Later, in the early first century BC, this part of Aristotle's writings was sold to the bibliophile Athenian Apellicon of Teos. After the occupation of Athens by the Roman general Sulla (86 BC), the manuscripts were

brought to Rome, where the grammarian Tyrannio (with whom Cicero was personally acquainted) assumed care of them. From Tyrannio they were passed on to Andronicus, as attested by Plutarch (*Sulla* 26) and Porphyry (*Vita Plotini* 24.9–11).

Porphyry credits Andronicus with organizing the transmitted material by collecting related material and distinguishing the several treatises. An additional piece of evidence for the impact of Andronicus is the catalog, preserved only in Arabic, was composed by Ptolemy-el-Garib. Ptolemy claimed that he possessed Andronicus' writings and that his catalog is based on Andronicus'. It seems therefore clear that Andronicus played an important role in the composition or edition of Aristotle's works.

What exactly his contribution to the formation of the *Corpus* was is less clear. However, there is a remarkable difference between the two earlier Hellenistic catalogs, which were prior to Andronicus' intervention, and the later catalog by Ptolemy, which presupposes Andronicus' edition. The earlier catalogs list many titles, but they are silent about some works that are included in our *Corpus*. Most notably, they do not mention Aristotle's biological works (with the exception of *On the History of Animals*). The later catalog of Ptolemy, by contrast, mentions almost all works in our *Corpus* and lists them in a row (29–54) as one coherent block. In addition, it almost always mentions the number of books of each work that we know from our editions.

Given that major works from our *Corpus* were absent from the two earlier lists (by Diogenes and Hesychius) or were not presented as a unit, and given that the later list presents an organized sequence of works that essentially resembles our *Corpus*, it is tempting to think that it was mostly due to Andronicus' intervention that this compilation came about. At any rate, even if we doubt that this was the work of one single editor, we can say that in the second century AD, Alexander of Aphrodisias commented only on those works of Aristotle that are included in our *Corpus*, which seems to indicate, first, that he had a version of this collection that is close to ours, and second, that he regarded the works in it as the most important works (he knew of other works by Aristotle as well, but used them only to shed light on the works included in the *Corpus*). So what we can say is that our *Corpus*, or a version similar to it, was formed between the first century BC and the second century AD—if not by Andronicus alone, then by editors who lived and worked after Andronicus, but before Alexander of Aphrodisias.

The achievement of Andronicus thus probably consists in presenting Aristotle's work as a well-organized system including several thematic groups that somehow build on each other. But he was likely not an editor in the modern sense, in the sense of attempting to provide an authoritative text based on the comparison of all available manuscripts.

It is difficult to get beyond this still relatively meager result. A lot depends on the credibility of the report by Strabo, who wishes to explain the temporary decline of Peripatetic philosophy after Theophrastus' death by the inaccessibility of the Aristotelian writings as well as the renewed interest in Aristotle in his own days by the eventual recovery of his work. In particular, Strabo's claim that Aristotle's main works were kept in a trench in Scepsis and thus became unavailable raises a difficult question: Did the Aristotelians who ran the Peripatetic school in Athens or the Aristotelians on the island

of Rhodes (to which Aristotle's student Eudemus retreated) really not keep any copies of the main works? This is one reason why many scholars find this part of Strabo's report just untrustworthy. Nonetheless, it remains true that the main changes between the ancient catalogs before and after Andronicus concern some of the works of our *Corpus Aristotelicum* that were not even mentioned in the earlier catalogs.

## 2.5. Bekker's Edition of the *Corpus Aristotelicum*

Immanuel Bekker's first critical edition of Aristotle's works (1831) includes all and only works that were part of the received *Corpus Aristotelicum*. It thus collects the same writings that were already included in the *Aldina*, except, as we saw, that Bekker includes the *Rhetoric* and the *Poetics*, while the *Aldina* did not. Bekker also kept the order of the works that the *Aldina* had used, together with the thematic grouping of Aristotle's works into four or five major thematic blocks:

1. logic and theory of argumentation,
2. philosophy of nature,
3. primary philosophy (metaphysics),
4. ethics and political theory, and
5. rhetoric and poetics (Bekker).

This scheme was essentially predetermined by the order and arrangement of the titles initiated by Andronicus and documented in Ptolemy, the only difference being that in the ancient catalog the fourth and the fifth group (that is, those including ethics, politics, rhetoric, and poetics) were positioned after the logic group and before the philosophy-of-nature group.

The following table lists in order all the writings included in Bekker: works thought to be dubious are marked with †, those thought to be spurious ones with ††. The customary Latinized titles (together with the Bekker pagination) provide an internationally usable system of reference. In most cases the English titles that are nowadays in use are translations or transpositions from the Latin. But it is not clear whether all these titles are Aristotle's, since sometimes the titles are derived from the first lines of a treatise or from their agenda, so that they qualify as proper "designators," but might not have been officially imposed as titles.

### The *Organon*: Logic, semantics, theory of argumentation and proof

<i>Categoriae</i>	<i>Categories</i>	1 <sup>a</sup> 1–15 <sup>b</sup> 33
<i>De Interpretatione</i>	<i>On Interpretation</i>	16 <sup>a</sup> 1–24 <sup>b</sup> 9
<i>Analytica Priora</i>	<i>Prior Analytics</i>	24 <sup>a</sup> 10–70 <sup>b</sup> 38
<i>Analytica Posteriora</i>	<i>Posterior Analytics</i>	71 <sup>a</sup> 1–100 <sup>b</sup> 17
<i>Topica</i>	<i>Topics</i>	100 <sup>a</sup> 18–164 <sup>b</sup> 19
<i>Sophistici Elenchi</i>	<i>Sophistical Refutations</i>	164 <sup>a</sup> 20–184 <sup>b</sup> 8

**Philosophy of nature**

## Starting-points of movement and cosmology

<i>Physica</i>	<i>Physics</i>	184 <sup>a</sup> 10–267 <sup>b</sup> 26
<i>De Caelo</i>	<i>On the Heavens</i>	268 <sup>a</sup> 1–313 <sup>b</sup> 23
<i>De Generatione et Corruptione</i>	<i>On Coming to Be and Passing Away</i>	314 <sup>a</sup> 1–338 <sup>b</sup> 19
<i>Meteorologica</i>	<i>Meteorology</i>	338 <sup>a</sup> 20–390 <sup>b</sup> 22
†† <i>De Mundo</i>	<i>On the Universe</i>	391 <sup>a</sup> 1–401 <sup>b</sup> 29

## Psychology

<i>De Anima</i>	<i>On the Soul</i>	402 <sup>a</sup> 1–435 <sup>b</sup> 25
<i>De Sensu et Sensibilibus</i>	<i>On Perception and Perceptible Objects</i>	436 <sup>a</sup> 1–449 <sup>b</sup> 3
<i>De Memoria</i>	<i>On Memory</i>	449 <sup>b</sup> 3–453 <sup>b</sup> 11
<i>De Somno et Vigilia</i>	<i>On Sleep</i>	453 <sup>b</sup> 11–458 <sup>a</sup> 32
<i>De Insomniis</i>	<i>On Dreams</i>	458 <sup>a</sup> 33–462 <sup>b</sup> 11
<i>De Divinatione per Somnum</i>	<i>On Prophecy during Sleep</i>	462 <sup>b</sup> 12–464 <sup>b</sup> 18
<i>De Longitudine et Brevitate Vitae</i>	<i>On Length and Shortness of Life</i>	464 <sup>b</sup> 19–467 <sup>b</sup> 9
<i>De Iuventute et Senectude, De Vita et Morte, De Respiratione</i>	<i>On Youth and Old Age, Life and Death, and Breathing</i>	467 <sup>b</sup> 10–480 <sup>b</sup> 30

## Biology/Zoology

†† <i>De Spiritu</i>	<i>On Breath</i>	481 <sup>a</sup> 1–486 <sup>b</sup> 4
<i>De Historia Animalium</i>	<i>On the History of Animals</i>	486 <sup>a</sup> 5–638 <sup>b</sup> 37
<i>De Partibus Animalium</i>	<i>On the Parts of Animals</i>	639 <sup>a</sup> 1–697 <sup>b</sup> 30
<i>De Motu Animalium</i>	<i>On the Movement of Animals</i>	698 <sup>a</sup> 1–704 <sup>b</sup> 3
<i>De Incessu Animalium</i>	<i>On the Progression of Animals</i>	704 <sup>a</sup> 4–714 <sup>b</sup> 23
<i>De Generatione Animalium</i>	<i>On the Generation of Animals</i>	715 <sup>a</sup> 1–789 <sup>b</sup> 20

**Dubious or spurious works on the philosophy of nature**

†† <i>De Coloribus</i>	<i>On Colors</i>	791 <sup>a</sup> 1–799 <sup>b</sup> 20
†† <i>De Audibilibus</i>	<i>On Things Heard</i>	800 <sup>a</sup> 1–804 <sup>b</sup> 39
†† <i>Physiognomonica</i>	<i>Physiognomics</i>	805 <sup>a</sup> 1–814 <sup>b</sup> 9
†† <i>De Plantis</i> 1–2	<i>On Plants</i>	815 <sup>a</sup> 10–830 <sup>b</sup> 4
†† <i>Mirabilium Auscultationes</i>	<i>On Marvelous Things Heard</i>	830 <sup>a</sup> 5–847 <sup>b</sup> 10
†† <i>Mechanica</i>	<i>Mechanics</i>	847 <sup>a</sup> 11–858 <sup>b</sup> 31
† <i>Problemata</i> 1–38	<i>Problems</i>	859 <sup>a</sup> 1–967 <sup>b</sup> 27
†† <i>De Lineis Insecabilibus</i>	<i>On Indivisible Lines</i>	968 <sup>a</sup> 1–972 <sup>b</sup> 33
†† <i>De Ventorum Situ et Nominibus</i>	<i>The Situation and Names of Winds</i>	973 <sup>a</sup> 1– <sup>b</sup> 25
†† <i>De Melisso, Xenophane, Gorgia</i>	<i>On Melissus, Xenophanes, and Gorgias</i>	974 <sup>a</sup> 1–980 <sup>b</sup> 21

**Primary philosophy**

<i>Metaphysica</i>	<i>Metaphysics</i>	980 <sup>a</sup> 22–1093 <sup>b</sup> 29
--------------------	--------------------	--

**Ethics and politics**

<i>Ethica Nicomachea</i>	<i>Nicomachean Ethics</i>	1094 <sup>a</sup> 1–1181 <sup>b</sup> 23
† <i>Magna Moralia</i>	<i>The Great Ethics</i>	1181 <sup>a</sup> 24–1213 <sup>b</sup> 30
<i>Ethica ad Eudemum</i>	<i>Eudemian Ethics</i>	1214 <sup>a</sup> 1–1249 <sup>b</sup> 25
†† <i>De Virtutibus et Vitiis</i>	<i>On Virtues and Vices</i>	1249 <sup>a</sup> 26–1251 <sup>b</sup> 37
<i>Politica</i>	<i>Politics</i>	1252 <sup>a</sup> 1–1342 <sup>b</sup> 34
† <i>Oeconomica</i>	<i>Economics</i>	1343 <sup>a</sup> 1–1353 <sup>b</sup> 27

**Rhetoric and poetics**

<i>Rhetorica</i>	<i>Rhetoric</i>	1354 <sup>a</sup> 1–1420 <sup>b</sup> 4
†† <i>Rhetorica ad Alexandrum</i>	<i>Rhetoric to Alexander</i>	1420 <sup>a</sup> 5–1447 <sup>b</sup> 7
<i>Poetica</i>	<i>Poetics</i>	1447 <sup>a</sup> 8–1462 <sup>b</sup> 18

**2.6. Writings That Did Not Make It into Bekker's Edition**

What has not been transmitted as a complete treatise within the *Corpus* was not included in Bekker's edition. The rest of Aristotle's (mostly lost) writings are traditionally treated as fragments. Collecting and editing these is less straightforward than editing writings included in the *Corpus*, for it is often controversial which reports by later authors should be taken as genuine and which can qualify even as verbatim quotations. Also, the number of references to Aristotle's works in antiquity is quite extensive. Where to start and where to end?

Nonetheless, after the completion of Bekker's edition, the Prussian Academy in Berlin offered a research award for the best study on Aristotle's fragments (although the collection of Aristotelian fragments was no longer uncharted territory by this time: the Istrian humanist Franciscus Patricius published the first systematic collection of Aristotelian fragments as early as 1571).

In the competition that followed, the librarian Valentin Rose, the author of a doctoral thesis from 1854 that tried to prove that all the reported or fragmentary works not included in the *Corpus Aristotelicum* are spurious, won the first prize. It was titled *Aristoteles Pseudepigraphus* and included a preliminary collection of Aristotelian fragments, although the author repeated and reinforced his old thesis that all the treatises to which these fragments are assigned are spurious. The printing of this treatise was financed by the Prussian Academy in 1863 and is known as R<sup>1</sup>.

Although Immanuel Bekker and other members of the editorial board disagreed with Rose's main thesis, they printed an abbreviated version of his collection of fragments in the fifth volume of the Academy edition (in addition to the two volumes that include Bekker's edition, the third and fourth volumes were dedicated to the Latin translation of Aristotle and to the scholia, that is, short commentaries from the margins of the manuscripts). This fifth volume was published in 1870 and is referred to as R<sup>2</sup>. In order to document his skepticism, Rose called his work *Aristotelis qui ferebantur librorum fragmenta*—"fragments of books which were transmitted as Aristotelian works." Between the competition and publication of the fifth volume of the Academy edition, Emil Heitz, the person who was ranked in the competition behind Rose, had published a (quite plausible) refutation of Rose's claims about the inauthenticity of the lost works assigned to Aristotle and had published his own collection of the fragments in France.<sup>3</sup> Finally, Rose published an improved and separate edition of the fragments in the more easily accessible *Teubneriana* series. It was published in 1886 and is referred to as R<sup>3</sup>. There is a certain irony in the fact that the most famous editor of Aristotle's fragments, who dedicated most of his scholarly life to this topic, never believed in the authenticity of what he collected.

More recently, scholarship has focused on selected lost or recovered works that seem to be particularly rewarding from a philosophical point of view. Three or four examples deserve to be highlighted. An important addition to the metaphysical treatise preserved in the *Corpus Aristotelicum* is the small treatise *On Forms*, important parts of which could be reconstructed from ancient commentaries on Aristotle's *Metaphysics*, in particular from Alexander of Aphrodisias. The retrieved text turned out to be one of the most significant testimonies for the Academic discussion about Plato's assumption of eternal Forms.

Another example of indirect transmission is Aristotle's *Protrepticus*, an exhortation to philosophy, in which Aristotle promotes the benefits of philosophy as he understands it. This is one of the few examples of how an exoteric Aristotelian text, one that

---

3. *Fragmenta Aristotelis*, collegit disposuit illustravit Aemilius Heitz (Paris, 1869).

explicitly addresses a broader public, might have looked. An important source for the reconstruction of this text is Iamblichus, who lived in the third and fourth centuries AD. Iamblichus compiled exhortative arguments from several authors without indicating which particular author he is referring to or quoting from. In 1869 Ingram Bywater first formulated the thesis that major parts of Iamblichus' *Protrepticus* were taken from Aristotle.<sup>4</sup> Even though Bywater's thesis has been largely accepted and the *Protrepticus* has been widely acknowledged as a quotable work of Aristotle's (in addition to the fragments edited by Rose), it is also an example of how difficult it is to reach scholarly agreement on the detailed reconstruction of a lost treatise, for it turned out to be notoriously difficult to determine which particular arguments in Iamblichus were taken from Aristotle and which were not.

A rather intricate and, to some extent, disappointing example of the hunt for Aristotelian fragments is provided by Aristotle's announced treatment of comedy. Aristotle himself refers several times to his discussion of the comical and laughable, but his *Poetics*, as it has come down to us, includes only a treatment of epic and tragedy. We have to conclude, then, that the *Poetics* originally included a second book (which is mentioned in Diogenes' catalog) which included an extended discussion of comedy, but that this second book is lost. That of all Aristotelian writings the treatment of the comical and of laughter is lost has been the stuff of crime stories and conspiracy theories. Scholars kept browsing ancient texts for hints on Aristotle's views about comedy. A manuscript from the tenth century AD, commonly referred to as *Tractatus Coislinianus* (F167), was suspected of including a summary of Aristotle's theory of the comedy, but no scholarly consensus has been reached.

While in the case of the other lost works of Aristotle scholars count themselves lucky when they are able to identify one or a few genuinely Aristotelian lines in later works, it was possible to regain almost the entirety of the treatise *The Athenian Constitution* from papyri found in the late nineteenth century (and, hence, after Rose's edition of the fragments). In this treatise the author gives a historical and systematic description of the development of the constitution of Athens down to Aristotle's time. Most likely this treatise was part of the collection of 158 constitutions mentioned by Diogenes Laertius and by Aristotle himself (*NE* 1181<sup>b</sup>15–24) as a starting point for his own philosophical inquiry into political constitutions in the *Politics*.

The case of *The Athenian Constitution* is unique: not only is it the longest continuous text from the supposedly Aristotelian writings that were not transmitted within the *Corpus Aristotelicum*, it is also the only text under the name of Aristotle that is directly edited from an ancient papyrus. It still might be, however, that this treatise was compiled not by Aristotle himself, but by members of the Aristotelian school as part of the more comprehensive project of collecting constitutions from various cities. Indeed, scholars have observed in this treatise traces of what they took to be stylistic and terminological differences to other Aristotelian works. Besides, it has always been suspected that it was

---

4. "On a Lost Dialogue of Aristotle," *The Journal of Philology* 2 (1869): 55–69.

## *Introduction*

simply impossible for one single person (even for a person as prolific as Aristotle) to draft the collection of all 158 constitutions by himself.